

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/898,809

Applicant(s)

RAJAGOPALAN ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas McKenzie, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas McKenzie, Ph.D.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Dr. Rajagopalan and Beverly Lyman.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 13 December 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants propose supplying documents showing that the structures of somatostatin receptor binding molecules etc were art-recognized. Applicants proposed using a Rule 132 declaration to enter this evidence. This would overcome the rejection made in point #5 of the Final Rejection. Applicants proposed deleting references and go with a Markush definition for E radical. This would overcome rejection #6. If the structures of radical "E" were made clear through the declaration, then the skilled synthetic chemist could devise synthesis of them and recognized which ones were not amenable to making to Applicant's sulfenates. This would render moot the rejection made in point #7 of the final rejection. Applicants proposed evidence concerning the molecules forming E would also overcome the written description rejection made in point #8. Applicants proposed amending claim 12 to claim a "photo procedure" and omit therapy. This would overcome the enablement rejection made in point #9. Claim 31 refers to the target tissues and not the diseases to be treated. Thus, the written description rejection made in point #10 would be moot. .